DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 722 HE 034 177

AUTHOR	Zemsky, Robert, Ed.
TITLE	Gender Intelligence.
INSTITUTION	Knight Higher Education Collaborative, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, Miami, FL.
PUB DATE	2001-09-00
NOTE	14p.; Based on a Roundtable on the Opportunities for Women in Higher Education, jointly convened in January 2001 by the American Association of University Women and the Knight Collaborative. Published three times per year.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.irhe.upenn.edu/pubs.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Opinion Papers (120)
JOURNAL CIT	Policy Perspectives; v10 n2 Sep 2001
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; College Administration; *College Faculty; *Females; *Gender Issues; Higher Education; *Sex Fairness

ABSTRACT

This essay explores the questions that women faculty in institutions of all kinds have been pondering. What would be the attributes of a higher education system that provides opportunities for growth and advancement to women that are equal to those provided for men? What aspects of academic culture would have to change to create a more equitable distribution of opportunity for women and men? Women now make up a substantial share of the academy, but the efforts and achievement of women, who are concentrated at the lower levels of administration and teaching, are still devalued at nearly every stage of their careers. To remedy these inequities, higher education must develop "gender intelligence," characterized by an enhanced ability to recognize and reward human achievement that contributes to an institution's mission, whether the work of men or women. Recommendations for bringing this change about include: (1) recast the canonical picture of what it means to have a successful career track; (2) make leaders of those who understand the need for change; (3) create productive venues for the telling and hearing of stories, the personal experiences of faculty members; (4) review institutional data comparing the professional experience of men and women; (5) develop policies and programs that support faculty who seek a balance between the demands of career and family; and (6) heighten the awareness of how the devaluation of women faculty persists. (SLD)

ED 455 722

September 2001
Volume 10
Number 2

P O L I C Y

PERSPECTIVES

The Knight Higher Education Collaborative
Supported by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

Gender Intelligence

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Saporito

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE034117

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

September 2001
Volume 10
Number 2

POLICY

PERSPECTIVES

The Knight Higher Education Collaborative
Supported by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

Gender Intelligence

It was not so long ago that American universities were male bastions—most students, nearly all faculty, and virtually all major leaders were men. The austere portraits of presidents adorning the administrative chambers of countless institutions denoted a lineage cast exclusively in a masculine mold. Even as the sartorial details and conventions of facial hair changed, the style of leadership itself remained fixed to a remarkable degree.

That history is increasingly at variance with the experience of the modern university. University students today are more likely to be women than men. Administrative positions, even in such areas as accounting or information systems, are increasingly occupied by women. New faculty members are almost as likely to be women as men—and even among the presidents who lead these institutions there is a notable increase in the number of women. The overall share of college and university presidencies held by women increased from 9.5 percent in 1986 to 19.3 percent in 1998. Of the 63 public and private institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU), women are now chief academic officers (and presumptive future presidents) at 12. Within the Ivy League there are now three institutions—Penn, Brown, and Princeton—headed by women.

The irony is that amidst all of this change, so much has remained the same. Most women who have won access to the inner circles of a research university readily recount tales outlining the price of admission. If the academy has become more welcoming of women faculty in its junior ranks, it continues to lag in efforts to build a more diverse profile of senior faculty, particularly in such fields as engineering, the sciences, law, and medicine, all of which have traditionally been dominated by men. More obvious is the continued absence of what might best be called a culture of inclusiveness. Even in institutions where they constitute a substantial proportion of the whole, women faculty and administrators often perceive themselves as being closer to the periphery than to the center of activity—and for women from minority groups, the sense of isolation is even more pronounced.

The persistent gap between the promise and practice of inclusiveness was driven home by the critical self-examination undertaken by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) over the last two years. In 1999, MIT President Charles Vest accepted the findings of a report outlining a pattern of consistent, if unconscious, discrimination against senior women faculty in its School of Science. This report, produced under the leadership of Biology Professor Nancy Hopkins and several faculty colleagues at MIT, was not the first to document the problem, but it quickly became national news, given the stature of the women faculty who had spurred the effort and the fact that Vest pledged to make the issue a part of his personal agenda. The outpouring of response to MIT's admission of discrimination came from women faculty throughout the nation, in all kinds of institutions, saying, in effect, "This is my story, too."

Our Roundtable on the Opportunities for Women in Higher Education was one result of the momentum generated by the MIT report. Convened jointly by the American Association of University Women and the Knight Collaborative, the roundtable took place on the campus of MIT in January 2001. We addressed the questions that women faculty in institutions of all kinds have pondered quietly—and sometimes not so quietly—for years: What would be the attributes of a profession that provides opportunities for growth and advancement to women in the same degree as it does to men? What aspects of academic culture—both in the profession at large and in individual institutions—would have to change in order to create a more equitable distribution of opportunity for women and men?

What aspects of the academic culture—both in the profession at large and in individual institutions—would have to change in order to create a more equitable distribution of opportunity for women and men?

Historically, minorities have succeeded in majority cultures largely by coming to understand and internalize the barriers they face and then, having come to expect that they will be treated differently, pursuing strategies designed to win small victories. In a fundamental way, the American Civil Rights Movement and its largely African-American successors changed all that. One of the lessons of the Civil Rights era is that there are never enough small victories. What is required is a fundamental alteration within the dominant ethos. Higher education's challenge is to develop a culture that yields to women the same recognition and rewards that it has always yielded to men—and to do so in such a way that the result is a wide variety of roles, responsibilities, and models of leadership reflective of the gender diversity that has come to characterize the academy.

Seeing and Believing

The fact that women now make up a substantial share of the academy is one marker of the progress that has been made. And yet there remains what Bernice Sandler has aptly described as higher education's "chilly climate" for women. The problems register with particular clarity among the nation's most prestigious institutions, where the efforts and achievements of women are still devalued at nearly every stage of their careers. This devaluation takes a variety of forms both subtle and overt. The ratio of men to women faculty tells part of the story; in the most remunerative fields, men continue to outnumber women on the faculty by substantial margins, particularly in the senior ranks. Beyond the ratio itself, a woman's sense of narrowed horizons may be expressed in the currency of heavier teaching assignments, fewer assignments to important committees, fewer grant opportunities, salary disparity with her male colleagues, fewer opportunities for collaboration and mentorship with other faculty, smaller offices and labs, and older equipment. The puzzle pieces, when assembled, outline a scenario in which women faculty encounter significant cultural barriers to the institutional resources and academic environment that support the work of all faculty.

Too often the historical progress that has been made in addressing these issues creates the illusion that all is well—that the obstacles confounding the path to a woman's professional advancement have all but disappeared. Women in the senior ranks are frequently distressed to observe how few of their junior colleagues understand or seek to address the reality of the constrained horizons they face because of their gender. Young women faculty often start out as optimists, believing that the important battles have been won. While they are grateful for the advancements made in the past, most young women resist becoming aggressive proponents of gender issues per se. In time, however, these younger women learn, as did their senior colleagues, that there is no escaping a dominant culture that slights without meaning to and devalues without adding up the costs associated with the loss of creativity and scholarship.

The occurrence of devaluation is a pervasive element in a woman's daily experience on a university or college faculty. It is death by a thousand paper cuts—an accumulation of small, incidental behaviors, few very remarkable in themselves, which collectively denote that women in the profession are considered to be less than their male counterparts. A common sign of diminution is the different forms of address accorded to

male and female faculty. The committee chair may refer to the contributions of "Dr. Williams, Dr. Edmundson—and Shirley," notwithstanding that Shirley holds the same advanced degree as her male colleagues. Or he may refer to the work of "Frank, Bill, and Professor Smith," signaling just as plainly that, in the chair's mind, Shirley Smith occupies a different sphere from that of her colleagues. Women are more likely to be assigned nurturing as opposed to leadership responsibilities in the handing out of department slots and committee assignments. They become part of the fabric instead of the design.

Often this devaluation of women occurs unconsciously through the agency of well-meaning persons who would be surprised to think of themselves as inherently favoring the contributions or achievements of men over those of women. One lesson derives from research carried out by Catherine Krupnick and others that involved videotaping classes in high schools, colleges, and professional schools. Analysis of these sessions revealed significant differences in the way that instructors perceived the participation of their male and female students. Regardless of whether the instructor was a man or a woman, the recurrent pattern was that male students tended to volunteer more quickly, talk more frequently, and speak longer than their female classmates. In fact, even those instructors who knew about the studies, who were ideologically committed to equal participation, and who actively encouraged women to speak up in their classes still systematically overestimated the frequency and length of the contributions to discussions made by female students. You had to play back the tape for them and literally count the exchanges before they would believe there was a persistent imbalance.

The Protective Provinces

While women today hold one-third of all faculty positions in American colleges and universities, they are clustered in the ranks of instructor and assistant professor. Women make up nearly half of all higher education faculty at these junior levels, but among the ranks of full professors, only about 20 percent are women.

The real issue is not so much women's ability to gain initial entry into the profession, though there remains some cause for concern even here. The most formidable barriers that women encounter are in seeking promotion to the senior ranks and flourishing once they are there. In a fundamental sense, these encounters are contests of power within a department or school. At stake is nothing less than the character of the academic unit itself: who decides its future agenda, how the resources and the work are distributed, who moves forward in what degree. Gaining a seat at this table is a daunting task, and there are many seekers of every race, ethnicity, and gender who fail in the attempt.

Too often the historical progress that has been made in addressing these issues creates the illusion that all is well—that the obstacles confounding the path to a woman's professional advancement have all but disappeared.

Yet in the final analysis, other factors being equal, women find it more difficult to have their work positively evaluated than do men. It was the senior women administrators among our roundtable who were most articulate in marshalling the anecdotal evidence of how seemingly objective standards become remarkably fluid in their ability to aggrandize the performance of men while diminishing that of women. In the final crux of judgment, being a male and relating to senior colleagues who are like yourself confers decided advantage. Women might fare better if all seekers in this quest could approach the table with their identities concealed. Studies of orchestra auditions have documented the same principle: the weight of judgment inclines disproportionately toward men over women, unless there is a screen concealing the identity of the musician being judged.

Typical was the recounting of two tenure cases in which the report on the service component of each candidate's record went something like this:

> "In the past three years Dr. A. has served on three committees—two at the department level, and even one that was university-wide."
>
> "In the past three years, Dr. B. has served on three committees—two at the department level, but only one of which was university-wide."

Guess which candidate was the male?

Through such means, the shades of delineation align to confer promotion on a favored candidate while subtly closing off another's path to advancement. As a result of such deliberations there are countless women, many of whom have devoted themselves to a faculty career above all other priorities in life, working as long and hard as their male colleagues, who find themselves relegated to the sidelines—parked at the rank of associate professor, largely isolated, overlooked for important committee assignments. Institutions and their departments may convince themselves that their actions have focused solely on the candidates' professional achievements, without regard for gender, race, or ethnicity. If this was in fact the case, the demographics of faculty would show something better than one woman for every four males in the rank of full professor; there would be greater parity in terms of resources conferred, space allotted, opportunities for collaboration and mentorship extended, and salary earned. Beyond the numbers, there is a pronounced cultural sense that, within these innermost circles, it remains a man's world. It is a place where women simply are not expected—just as they are not really expected to be members of the National Academy of Science: of that institution's 1,960 American members, just 6.6 percent are women.

The Outward Trappings

The likelihood of a woman's advancing to the privileged domains of power and opportunity is further diminished if she has elected to mix academic pursuits with other, predominantly family, priorities. The very notion of scholarly productivity often requires the appearance that a faculty member has embraced professional achievement to the exclusion of all other goals. Presumably a man can balance the demands of career and family through a spousal division of labor which casts him in the role of the dominant professional contributor. To be sure, it is increasingly common today for a husband to assume a greater share of domestic responsibilities, allowing a wife to focus more of her time on meeting professional demands. Even in such arrangements, however, a woman who bears a child risks the impression that she has compromised her professional dedication. It is a culture that in some settings may be forgiving of a single offspring, but almost never two—a phenomenon sometimes referred to as the "China policy."

Faculty interviews conducted in one school of medicine revealed that many women blamed themselves for the family decisions they had made: "It was my own choice and my own fault that I had a child." In telling her story, a woman would explain that, because she was now working only 60 hours per week, she could not expect the same professional recognition and advancement as others who had kept their career goals closer to front and center. Some instances of bias against women have in fact been displayed by other women who did not elect to have children.

Women are more likely to be assigned nurturing as opposed to leadership responsibilities in the handing out of department slots and committee assignments. They become part of the fabric instead of the design.

The begrudging of children and family commitments is one symptom of a culture that often becomes preoccupied with research over teaching and, in particular, with counting the number of publications a faculty member produces as the indicator of quality. Senior faculty often observe that the standards of achievement are much higher today than when they themselves were entering the profession. In the broadest sense, it is important that standards have risen; the fact that they have done so is a tribute to the vitality of higher education and its contribution to society. But if the standards of tenure and promotion have risen, they have in too many cases also become narrower. All too often the outward form of achievement—notably, the accumulation of a stack of publications—counts for as much as the importance of questions the research addressed, the significance of its findings and conclusions, and its contribution to human knowledge. Careers can be made or broken on the basis of publications that are counted more than read.

No one suggests that standards should be lowered. What is needed, however, is a culture that emphasizes quality over quantity and allows a faculty member's achievement to be assessed by the full range of professional roles and responsibilities he or she is expected to embody. For men and women alike, placing inordinate weight on the number of publications reduces the concept of standards to formulations that

are mechanistic, rigid, and ultimately destructive of the academic environment as a place for the pursuit and discovery of knowledge.

Hearing the Stories

It is easy to forget that the structure of the academy is not ordained from on high. Institutional structures are defined by human behavior. Most academic disciplines have their roots in histories that reflect very deliberate choices about what should be advanced and who should advance it. Though its primary mission is to promote teaching, learning, and research, higher education retains most of the trappings and procedures of a guild, designed to protect the interests of its members. Until compelled to change by outside forces, most guilds will naturally consolidate power from within.

Those who experience differential treatment in an academic setting inevitably find themselves confronting a set of forces stronger than themselves. The prevailing culture leads them to believe that a professional disappointment is simply the result of individual shortcomings. To resist this interpretation in a very public way is to risk the charge of pitting merely personal concerns against the structures and standards of the academy. As a result, many women have simply borne in silence the thousand paper cuts and the deeper disparities that separate their own professional experience from that of their male faculty colleagues. What has often freed them is the discovery that they are not alone—that stories told in public become shared experiences.

Indeed, this telling of stories is a powerful first step in changing the character of an institution. It is an action that exerts pressure on an existing order, helping to drive a cultural shift that would allow more women into the centers of power in a university or college. The sequence of events that resulted in the MIT admission of gender discrimination began with a handful of women—Nancy Hopkins, Sally W. Chisolm, Paola M. Rizzoli, JoAnne Stubbe, and several other colleagues in the institution's School of Science—discussing with one another their experiences as faculty members. In telling their individual stories, they discovered that there were remarkable similarities linking them together. The steps that followed—the gaining of a dean's support, the formation of a committee, the gathering and analysis of institutional data, the presentation and formal acceptance of a report finding that discrimination had occurred—all were a direct result of these colleagues' initial recounting of their personal experiences within the institution.

The MIT case is not the only instance of storytelling becoming the germ of institutional change: a major study seeking to address disparities between the advancement and support of male and female faculty in the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine has employed the interview as a central technique, providing women faculty members with an opportunity to tell their stories. Since the time of this project's inception, the institution has taken steps to narrow significantly the disparities between men and women faculty in terms of salary equity, access to information for faculty development, and the expectation of promotion. At the University of Michigan, data obtained from interviews of women faculty played a central role in revising the University's policy regarding professional leave for childbirth.

Telling stories is a way of bringing human experience into the broader realm of institutional culture; it permeates the imaginary barrier that would separate matters of institutional structure from merely personal concerns. Storytelling illustrates the maxim, expressed in the vernacular of the 1970s, that "the personal is political." It brings the data of individual experience into the foreground, unlocking feelings that may have been suppressed, and presenting the institution itself in a different light. The telling and compiling of narratives helps cast in sharper relief the themes linking different people's experiences as members of a college or university faculty. It is activity that can lead to heightened understanding and often very different conclusions about the factors contributing to particular outcomes in a career. For many women, storytelling becomes a means of asking how much of their own experience is the result of individ-

The very notion of scholarly productivity often requires the appearance that a faculty member has embraced professional achievement to the exclusion of all other goals.

ual failure, and how much an outcome of the systematic devaluation of women in the institution.

The likelihood of such a question gaining a real hearing depends on the character of leadership within the institution itself. No element is more important to changing institutional culture than leadership—not just at the top but at each successive level, and particularly within individual departments. A president, chief academic officer, or school dean can take important steps to signal that achievement of the same caliber should be accorded equal recognition and reward,

All too often the outward form of achievement—notably, the accumulation of a stack of publications—counts for as much as the importance of questions the research addressed, the significance of its findings and conclusions, and its contribution to human knowledge.

whether performed by men or women. But leadership at the department level—in the chair and in key committees—is often the most critical factor in changing a dominant culture. At any level, providing commensurate opportunities to an expanded range of human talent within an institution's faculty requires leaders who will wade the stream and counter the current of human practice that inherently favors the achievements of men above those of women.

The next critical ingredient for change is a willingness to entertain conflict—to let the stories play out to natural, sometimes even messy, conclusions. All too often, the dominant leadership style in institutions is one that is averse to conflict and disagreement. Many of those in academic leadership positions today define their principal task as the avoidance or even suppression of conflict. We believe that it is only by giving an ear to human conflict that change will occur in the culture of institutions. Colleges and universities must be settings in which the personal experience of the institution can be told, and in which there are institutional structures to translate the findings from these stories into policies and programs. We do not suggest that storytelling in itself should be a definitive source for deciding institutional policy. Rather, the contribution of the personal narrative is to help formulate what questions should be asked and what data ought to be considered as part of the decision-making process.

In Pursuit of Gender Intelligence

The challenge of creating a more equitable distribution of opportunity between men and women faculty goes beyond the question of attracting more women into the pipeline; there are many bright women who envision themselves pursuing an academic career and who readily accept the challenges it entails. The problem centers on the use the academy makes of this human resource once enlisted—on the loss of human talent and productivity that so often occurs when women do not receive the support needed to reach their full potential.

One strategy in preparing young women for faculty careers is simply to school them in the treatment they can expect in settings where the culture is predominantly male. Depending on a woman's particular disposition, her survival strategy could be to tough it out, pursuing the rewards of a faculty career with the unwavering determination of an armored tank. Another, more prevalent strategy would be of quiet submission to the prevailing ethos, enduring the little diminutions and larger disparities that separate a woman's experience from her male counterparts. But individual solutions per se do not address or change the deeper systemic problem within universities and colleges. While a schooling in survival may help some women faculty, the ultimate challenge is to change institutions to eliminate the disparities that they experience.

Our recommendations do not seek simply to advance more women to the senior ranks of the academy, though that could be one result. Neither do we seek a different set of standards for men and women. We seek rather to create institutions that are different—that make more effective use of the range of human talent at their disposal. Recognizing that there are deeply ingrained cultural biases that privilege one gender over another, we nonetheless seek an environment that reaches beyond gender blindness—beyond the screen that would hide the identity of the performer from the judicial panel. Higher education's next step must be toward a condition we call gender intelligence. Such intelligence is characterized by a greatly enhanced ability to recognize and reward

human achievement that contributes to an institution's mission, whether it be the work of men or of women. Gender intelligence is the recognition of the fact that all the tasks a university or college confronts can be met by women as well as men, not just in the junior ranks but at every level and in every field. In fulfilling their mission to educate people for roles they will assume in their working lives, universities and colleges need to demonstrate by example how a professional environment can accord to women the same opportunities it does to men of comparable achievement.

The cultural changes that would allow women to move forward more readily are the same changes that will allow higher education institutions to take a next step in their own development. The problems facing society in the years ahead require a synthesis of many kinds of people and approaches. In a variety of ways, the structures and boundaries that have traditionally defined the academy are already yielding to new formulations to address problems combining two or more disciplines. Interdisciplinary centers demonstrate a growing willingness within the academy to be collaborative and to create new areas of inquiry that draw collectively on faculty with different training and strengths; such centers exemplify the different ways in which a faculty role can be defined and individual achievement can be assessed.

These recommendations sketch the broad outlines of a cultural change that needs to occur throughout higher education. The texture and composition of these actions may differ by institutional type as well as by the particular circumstances of a university or college. Creating an environment of gender intelligence will require that all institutions undertake some version of the following:

Recast the canonical picture of what it means to be on a successful career track. Higher education institutions need to accord a more balanced recognition of the full range of criteria that are traditionally applied in the determination of tenure and promotion. Without seeking to lower standards of achievement, universities and colleges need to understand how a given configuration of standards—in particular, the emphasis on research of a particular kind over other forms of research and scholarly achievement, and on the sheer quantity of research publication—effectively narrows the definition of a successful faculty career and undermines the full potential of the academy as a place of discovery. A more flexible and enlightened disposition about the range of activities that constitute successful faculty achievement would perform a service to research and scholarship for men and women alike.

Make leaders of those who understand the need for change. Leadership at every level is required to build an institutional culture that regards the contributions and achievements of women in the same light as those of men. A president or provost can set the tone and begin a process of cultural change, but real change also requires leadership at the department level. Higher education needs more leaders who will work to ensure that the resources available to women faculty—including salary, space, equipment, mentorship opportunities, support for research and teaching—are commensurate with those of men and adequate to the fulfillment of women's professional goals and responsibilities. In all institutions, the most important and powerful committees must come to include a greater number of women, both to accelerate cultural change and achieve a more equal distribution of what is widely understood as a professional perquisite and mark of recognition. There is a need for more people in positions of power who do not simply close off expressions of human emotion and conflict in the course of making institutional decisions. Higher education needs to graduate from the ideal of leadership as successful conflict avoidance.

Leadership at the department level—in the chair and key committees—is often the most critical factor in changing a dominant culture.

Create productive venues for the telling and hearing of stories. One of the most important steps an institution can take in creating a more equitable professional environment is to provide occasions for individual faculty to relate their personal experiences of the institution. We do not mean to suggest that institutions should simply proclaim a time for women to talk and men to listen; in the best sense, storytelling becomes a way both of understanding and solving problems, for women and men alike. An institution that seeks to create a vital and fulfilling professional environment must be willing not just to hear the stories that faculty tell of their experiences, but also to set in place institutional structures and processes to address

problems that the stories reveal. The research undertaken by Linda Fried and her colleagues at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, for instance, yielded a set of practical interventions designed to address the inequities that the stories in the form of interviews had revealed regarding the treatment of men and women faculty. Here the areas of intervention included faculty development, mentoring, rewards, and structural obstacles, as well as monitoring and evaluation.

What is required is an environment in which men and women alike build institutions that future generations of faculty will find to be vital and fulfilling places to work, regardless of their gender.

Systematically review institutional data comparing the professional experience of women and men. In addition to data on appointments, tenure, promotion, and salary, institutions must examine information concerning the dimensions of faculty members' inclusion in the academic life of an institution—such things as appointment to key committees and leadership positions, the availability of mentoring and partnership opportunities with other faculty members, as well as institutional support provided in the competition for external grants. An institution that commits itself to reviewing these data every two years would attain a candid measure of its progress in building a more equitable environment for women and men. It would also learn what impact a more equal distribution of opportunity has on the performance of men and women. The very practice of compiling such data sends an important signal that the institution takes these matters seriously. The committee appointed to oversee this process should also develop action recommendations, along with timetables for implementation and criteria for assessing progress.

Develop policies and programs that support faculty who seek a balance between the demands of career and family. Virtually all men and women who are members of an academic community are also members of a family. There are seasons in life when the responsibilities toward these two social units create extraordinary conflicts on a faculty member's time and energy. Caring for children in their youth, or for parents in advanced age, confronting a major unexpected illness in a family member—all of these can strain highly capable faculty to a considerable degree. Many institutions—including MIT, Stanford, Princeton, and the University of Michigan—currently have policies and programs to address these kinds of dilemmas that faculty and staff may encounter in the course of a career. Such initiatives need continued exploration and support.

Heighten the awareness of how the devaluation of women faculty persists. In as many ways as possible, higher education must work, in effect, to play back the tape illustrating how small and even unconscious behaviors contribute to the demeaning of women and the diminishment of opportunities they experience as faculty members. Good old-fashioned consciousness-raising may seem as dreary and formidable a task as refloating a foundered ship. Yet the need to bring submerged issues to the surface remains as great as ever. Presentations, seminars, and forums need to occur not just within institutions but in the meetings of disciplinary organizations to drive home the ways in which women are inherently disadvantaged by the treatment and regard they experience from their male colleagues.

* * *

Any effort to promote greater parity between the opportunities that men and women experience in the academy faces an odd dilemma: the very progress made in overcoming differential treatment in the past can become an impediment to continued progress in the future. The sense of accomplishment resulting from higher education's welcoming of more women to the professoriate can all too easily create the impression that the issue has been satisfactorily resolved—that gender bias is history. Many women at the outset of a faculty career may not perceive any disparities between their own prospects and those of their male colleagues. By the time a woman fully understands what has happened to her, it may well be too late to make a difference.

In his introductory remarks to the "Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT" in 1999, President Vest wrote:

> I, like most of my male colleagues, believe that we are highly supportive of our junior women faculty members. . . . They generally are content and well supported in many, though not all dimensions. However, I sat bolt upright in my chair when a senior woman, who has felt unfairly treated for some time, said "I also felt very positive when I was young."

The generation of younger faculty who will benefit most from continued progress on this issue are at a point in their careers where they are not likely to be the driving force. Cultural reform is necessarily the work of an institution's senior faculty and leadership. Both vision and persistence are needed to build a culture that outlasts those who form a particular phase of an institution's history. What is required is an environment in which men and women alike build institutions that future generations of faculty will find to be vital and fulfilling places to work, regardless of their gender.

Promising Practices: A Search for Exemplars

The Knight Collaborative's goal in *Policy Perspectives* is to help frame the national discussion of broad issues concerning higher education. *Exemplars*, an accompanying publication, focuses on institutions that have demonstrated leadership in addressing particular challenges.

The Knight Collaborative welcomes information about colleges or universities that have shown promising initiative in addressing a problem described in *Policy Perspectives*. The *Exemplars* accompanying this issue, for example, features an institution that has taken steps to make civic engagement central to its learning programs—a subject discussed in the November 2000 issue of *Policy Perspectives* ("Disputed Territories").

Building on the roundtable that yielded the essay, "Gender Intelligence," we seek to learn about universities or colleges that are making progress in according professional recognition and rewards to women faculty commensurate with their male colleagues.

If you know of an institution whose accomplishments might be of interest to a national audience through the venue of *Exemplars*, please send a brief description to exemplars@irhe.upenn.edu, or contact us by mail at:

Exemplars
Knight Higher Education Collaborative
4200 Pine Street, 5A
Philadelphia, PA 19104-4090

The Knight Higher Education Collaborative and its publications are funded in part through the generosity of the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation.

The essay, "Gender Intelligence," is based on the Roundtable on the Opportunities for Women in Higher Education, jointly convened in January 2001 by the American Association of University Women and the Knight Collaborative. The following individuals were participants in that roundtable and helped to shape the essay that appears in this issue of Policy Perspectives.

Cheryl Achterberg
Professor of Nutrition and Dean
Schreyer Honors College
Pennsylvania State University

J. Herman Blake
Professor of Sociology and Director
African American Studies Program
Iowa State University

Mary Burgan
General Secretary
American Association of University Professors

Nancy Cantor
Chancellor
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Denise Denton
Professor and Dean
College of Engineering
University of Washington

Cynthia Fisher
Associate Professor of Biology (retired)

Linda P. Fried
Professor of Medicine, Epidemiology, and Health Policy and Director
Center on Aging and Health
Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions

Daniel L. Goroff
Professor of Mathematics and Associate Director
Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning
Harvard University

Carol Hollenshead
Director
Center for the Education of Women
University of Michigan

Nancy Hopkins
Amgen Inc. Professor of Biology
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Beth Kern
Associate Professor of Accounting
Indiana University South Bend

Juan E. Mestas
Chancellor
University of Michigan-Flint

Susan Westerberg Prager
Provost
Dartmouth College

Bernice Resnick Sandler
Senior Scholar
Women's Research and Education Institute

Daniel Siegel
Attorney-at-Law
Siegel & Lee

Ruth J. Simmons
President
Brown University

Heidi Rauscher Tilghman
Assistant Professor of Modern Languages
Knox College

Charles M. Vest
President
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

From the American Association of University Women:

Amy Falk
Tara Kelley-Baker
Patricia McCabe
Jacqueline E. Woods

From the Knight Higher Education Collaborative:

Ann J. Duffield
Melvin George
Joan S. Girgus
Gregory R. Wegner
Robert Zemsky

Policy Perspectives is a publication of the Knight Higher Education Collaborative.

Robert Zemsky
Senior Editor

Ann J. Duffield
Program Director, Knight Collaborative
Senior Consultant, Marts & Lundy, Inc.

Gregory R. Wegner
Managing Editor

James F. Galbally, Jr.
Contributing Editor

Joan S. Girgus
Contributing Editor

William F. Massy
Contributing Editor

Copyright © 2001 by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. All rights reserved.

To have your name added to the *Policy Perspectives* mailing list, please include your name and address in an e-mail to pp-requests@irhe.upenn.edu (or contact us by the other means listed below).

To convey address changes, requests for reprints, or mailing list additions, you can contact *Policy Perspectives* by any of the following means:

Knight Higher Education Collaborative
4200 Pine Street, 5A
Philadelphia, PA 19104-4090
Phone: (215) 898-4585
E-mail: pp-requests@irhe.upenn.edu

Issues of *Policy Perspectives* can also be downloaded from our Web site:
www.irhe.upenn.edu/pubs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Successful Strategies in the Making:
Wharton-IRHE Executive Education For Higher Education

This intensive program provides leadership teams with the tools to solve real institutional problems. Convened at the Wharton School's Aresty Institute on the University of Pennsylvania campus, the program limits enrollment to eight institutions, each of which sends a five-member team of faculty and administrators to address a specific issue.

- **Building Teams for Successful Strategies:** Each team meets initially on campus with a Knight Collaborative senior associate to define the problem it needs to address. Through the course of the Wharton-IRHE sessions, team members work closely together, detailing a plan for accomplishing this priority.
- **Problem- and Solution-Centered:** In four days of instruction combined with facilitated work sessions, each team determines specific strategies for solving the institutional problem it brings to Philadelphia. The program applies an action learning model to convey management principles and help build skills that the leadership team can apply to its own institutional setting.
- **Wharton Expertise:** The program is taught by faculty of Wharton's Aresty Institute, as well as Penn's Institute for Research on Higher Education. The curriculum includes instruction in the dynamics of leadership, principles of organizational change, skills of negotiation, and the interplay between academic values and higher education's markets.

Through the past five years, 103 teams representing 83 institutions have made time to make decisions at Wharton-IRHE Executive Education. *Reserve a space now for your institutional team in one of the program's upcoming sessions.*

January 13-17, 2002
July 28-August 1, 2002

For more information and a list of institutions that have sent leadership teams, please visit our Web site:
www.irhe.upenn.edu/execed

or contact

Rick Morgan, Assistant Director
Knight Higher Education Collaborative
4200 Pine Street, 5A
Philadelphia, PA 19104-4090

Email: Morgan@irhe.upenn.edu

Telephone: (215) 898-4585

Fax: (215) 898-9876